REMARKS

Claims 1 and 5-13 had been cancelled. Amended claims 4, 14, 15, 34, and 42, and claims 2, 3, 16-33 and 35-41 are in the application.

Claims 14-16, 18, 20-21, 24-26, 28, 29, 30, 34, 36-38, 41, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Noeske.

Independent claims 14, 15, 34, and 42 have been amended herein. It is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 14, 15, 34, and 42 are distinguishable over Noeske as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter, merely "Noeske"). For example, it is respectfully submitted that Noeske does not disclose "said first intermediate signal is distinct from intermediate signals obtained during said extraction of said stereo-sum signal from said incoming multiplex signal" as in independent claim 14; "said first intermediate signal is distinct from said multiplex signal" as in independent claims 15 and 34; and "mixing means situated along said first signal path upstream from a branching off point of said third signal path from said first signal path" as in independent claim 42.

Claims 18, 20-21, and 24-26 are dependent from one of amended independent claims 14 and 15. As such, claims 18, 20-21, and 24-26 are distinguishable from Noeske for at least the reasons previously described.

Furthermore, with regard to independent claims 28 and 36, if it is assumed (merely for the sake of argument) that the processing effected by mixer 21 in Figs. 2 and 4 of Noeske constitutes a coherent demodulation of a multiplex signal employing a second harmonic of the pilot carrier of the multiplex signal so as to obtain an intermediate signal (as claimed), then the resultant intermediate signal will be the signal output by mixer 21 and fed to decimator 40. However, Noeske does not teach or suggest that an amplitude modulated RDS signal is derived

on the basis of this intermediate signal. Additionally, although the respective signal lines of signal x1.3 and the aforementioned intermediate signal output by mixer 21 are illustrated as crossing, there is no physical connection between these two signal lines. Moreover, the aforementioned assumption itself contradicts the teachings of Noeske. That is, Noeske teaches neither coherent demodulation nor employment of a second harmonic of a pilot carrier of the multiplex signal. Instead, Noeske teaches a mixing employing a carrier signal having twice the frequency of a decimated carrier signal.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 28 and 36 are distinguishable from Noeske.

Claims 29-30, 37, 38, and 41 are dependent from one of independent claims 28 and 36. As such, claims 29-30, 37, 38, and 41 are also distinguishable from Noeske for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 17, 19, 22, 23, 27, 31-32, 33, 35 and 39-40 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 2-4 were allowable over the prior art of record. It should be noted that claim 4 was dependent from claim 1 and had been withdrawn. Since the Examiner has indicated that claim 4 is now allowable, and since claim 4 was dependent from canceled independent claim 1, claim 4 has been amended herein so as to depend from allowable independent claim 2.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment and these remarks and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4 and 14-42 and the allowance of this application with claims 2-4 and 14-42 are respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: _____
Dennis M. Smid
Registration No. 34,930
Tel. (212) 588-0800